arXiv:1607.06293v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 8 Aug 2016

Spin-charge transformation of the Hubbard and t-J models

Johan Carlström
Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst MA 01003 USA
(Dated: August 9, 2016)

A mapping of the Hubbard and t-J models onto a description in terms of spins and spin-less fermions is derived. This transformation can be combined with the Fedotov-Popov fermionisation technique, where spin-1/2 systems are mapped onto two-component lattice fermions with imaginary chemical potential. The result is a generalisation of the Fedotov-Popov formulation to the case of finite doping that makes it possible to treat the Hubbard and t-J models as spin-models in the presence of a finite density of holes and doublons. While strongly interacting lattice fermions near half-filling is an extremely challenging problem, spin-systems can be efficiently treated with current simulation techniques.

Recently, there has been substantial progress with numerical treatment of correlated fermions. Examples of simulation techniques applicable to these systems include wave-function methods such as DMRG [1], finite size cluster approximations like DCA [2], and Green's function methods like Diagrammatic Monte Carlo [3, 4].

Last year, the Simons collaboration on the many electron problem [5] published an extensive comparison and bench-marking of a wide range of methods applied to the Hubbard model [6]. One of the primary purposes of this article is to assess in what parameter regions currently available numerical methods are accurate. Their conclusion is that a substantial part of the ground state properties are now under control, and that these appear to connect smoothly to finite temperature results. The most substantial uncertainties exist near half-filling and for interaction strengths of $4 \leq U/t \leq 8$, also the parameter region that is the most relevant for cuprate superconductivity.

Simulation techniques for lattice fermions can also be applied to quantum spin systems. This is made possible by Fedotov-Popov fermionisation [7], which maps spin-models onto lattice fermions with imaginary chemical potential. This technique has been successfully applied together with Diagrammatic Monte Carlo to compute magnetic properties of the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model on the triangular lattice [8, 9] as well as the pyrochlore lattice [10].

Under Fedotov-Popov fermionisation, spins map according to

$$|\sigma\rangle \rightarrow |n_\sigma = 1, n_{\bar{\sigma}} = 0\rangle, \tag{1}$$

(where $\bar{\sigma} = -\sigma$) so that the state with spin σ is mapped onto a state that has one fermion with the spin σ. This however introduces unphysical states corresponding to lattice points with either 0 or 2 fermions that have no corresponding spin-state. Remarkably, these can be projected out from the partition function by the introduction of an imaginary chemical potential term of the form:

$$H' = H + \sum_j \frac{i\pi}{2\beta}(n_{j,\uparrow} + n_{j,\downarrow} - 1). \tag{2}$$

This term removes unphysical contributions to the trace by ascribing to them complex phases such that they cancel. Thus, it becomes possible to treat spin models as lattice fermions.

As the Fedotov-Popov technique relies on cancelation of unphysical states, it can not be applied to models that exhibit only a single such state. A generalisation of this method that addresses this problem is Universal fermionisation [11]. This technique extends the Hilbert space by introducing an additional degree of freedom in the form of an auxiliary fermionic field:

$$H' = H + \sum_j \frac{i\pi}{\beta} P_j (n_{A,j} - 1/2),\ [H, P_j] = 0, \tag{3}$$

where P_j is a projection operator that returns 1 if the site j is in an unphysical configuration, and 0 otherwise, while $n_A = c_A^\dagger c_A$ is the number operator for the auxiliary fermions. The Hilbert space is thus extended so that the site j has two unphysical configurations whose contribution to the partition function cancels due to them having different complex phase (corresponding to $P_j = 1$ and $n_{A,j} = 0, 1$).

This technique can for example be employed to the t-J model to remove "forbidden" doubly occupied sites from the trace. It has also been proposed as a way of dealing with the Hubbard model at large U by removing doubly occupied sites and then reintroducing them in the form of bosons, that are subsequently fermionised, a procedure referred to as second fermionisation [11]. In this way, large or infinite interaction terms can be removed from lattice fermion models.

This letter will discuss strategies for numerically addressing correlated fermions that are based on transforming the original models. In particular, it will be show that there are fundamental problems that emerge in models of correlated fermions that can not be directly resolved through fermionisation. Rather, addressing these issues also requires transforming the underlying degrees of freedom.

As a starting point for analysing this problem we will

consider the fermionised t-J model:

$$H = \sum_{ij\sigma} t_{ij}\tilde{c}^\dagger_{i,\sigma}\tilde{c}_{j,\sigma} + \sum_{ij} J_{ij}\ (S_i \cdot S_j - \frac{n_i n_j}{4}) - \sum_j \mu n_j,$$

$$H' = H + \sum_j \frac{i\pi}{\beta} n_{j,\uparrow} n_{j,\downarrow}(n_{A,j} - 1/2) \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{c}^\dagger_\sigma = (1 - c^\dagger_{\bar{\sigma}} c_{\bar{\sigma}}) c^\dagger_\sigma$, $\tilde{c}_\sigma = (1 - c^\dagger_{\bar{\sigma}} c_{\bar{\sigma}}) c_\sigma$ are projected creation and annihilation operators while $n_i = c^\dagger_{i,\uparrow} c_{i,\uparrow} + c^\dagger_{i,\downarrow} c_{i,\downarrow}$ is the number operator. Since the forbidden state corresponds to double occupation of a lattice point, the projection operator (P_j in Eq. 3) takes the form $n_{j,\uparrow} n_{j,\downarrow}$.

When $\beta\mu \gg 1$ and $\mu > zt$, the density of holes is small, and the leading contribution to the partition function of H comes from unphysical doubly occupied sites. Meanwhile, contributions from the physical sector are sub-leading by a factor $\sim \exp(-\beta\mu)$, and in the limit of half-filling when $\beta\mu \to \infty$, the statistical weight of physical configurations approaches zero.

The practical implications of this behavior become clear if we treat this problem analytically in the atomic limit, $t = J = 0$. Introducing a control parameter ξ for the projection operator we obtain

$$H' = -\mu(n_\uparrow + n_\downarrow) + \xi \frac{i\pi}{\beta} n_\uparrow n_\downarrow (n_A - 1/2), \quad (5)$$

$$\langle n \rangle = \frac{2e^{\beta\mu} + 2e^{2\beta\mu}\cos(\pi\xi/2)}{1 + 2e^{\beta\mu} + e^{2\beta\mu}\cos(\pi\xi/2)} \quad (6)$$

where $\xi = 1$ corresponds to the fully projected Hamiltonian. In the atomic limit, diagrammatic expansion in its simplest form is equivalent to expansion in a taylor series in ξ. Thus, the order of perturbation theory required to compute (6) with an accuracy goal of say 1% is easily obtained. For the case $\beta\mu = 0$ and $\langle n \rangle = 2/3$ its necessary to compute 4 orders, for $\beta\mu = 3/2$ and $\langle n \rangle \approx 0.9$ we need 16 orders, and for $\beta\mu = 4$ and $\langle n \rangle \approx 0.99$, diagrams up to an order of 100 is not sufficient. The decreasing statistical weight of the physical sector is thus associated with increasingly poor convergence properties that eventually prevents treatment with diagrams or any other methods based on series expansion.

More generally, this case is an example of large or singular corrections to the density matrix coming from non-linear terms in the Hamiltonian. Defining the correction c_n to the weight of the state $|n\rangle$ as

$$\langle n|\rho_1|n\rangle = (1 + c_n)\langle n|\rho_0|n\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where ρ_1 and ρ_0 are the density matrices of the interacting and noninteracting theories, it is clear that if $\langle n|\rho_1|n\rangle$ is finite while $\langle n|\rho_0|n\rangle \to 0$, then c_n diverges, as occurred in the example above. This singular behaviour is also present in the Hubbard model when the filling factor is near unity and $\mu \to \infty$.

Thus, the problems of treating strongly interacting lattice fermions with diagrammatic techniques (or any other methods based on expansion in the interaction terms) are not limited to large expansion parameters, but also includes large or singular corrections to the density matrix. Fermionisation techniques can address the former of these problems by transforming interaction terms, yet they preserve the density matrix and thus any singular behaviour associated with it. Therefore, in order to simulate these models near unit filling, it is necessary to transform not only the interaction terms, but also the basic degrees of freedom.

In the limit of unit filling and strong onsite repulsion, lattice fermions are effectively described by the Heisenberg model which can be efficiently treated by current fermionisation techniques in combination with diagrammatic methods [8–10]. Thus, a natural approach to this problem is to treat the t-J and Hubbard models as generalisations of quantum spin systems to the case of finite doping. The central idea of this work is that this can be achieved by applying a spin-charge transformation to the original models. The spins are then in turn mapped onto fermions through Fedotov-Popov fermionisation. In the case of the t-J model, doubly occupied sites are removed from the partition function through Universal fermionisation. The result is a description in terms of a fermionised spin model on top of which holes and doublons are added in the form of spin-less fermions.

The first step of this mapping is spin-charge transformation of the Hubbard model:

$$H = -t \sum_{\langle i,j\rangle,\sigma} c^\dagger_{i,\sigma} c_{j,\sigma} + \sum_i \Big(U n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} - \mu n_i \Big), \quad (8)$$

where $c^\dagger_\sigma$, c_σ are creation and annihilation operators of a spin-σ fermion on i, $n_{i,\sigma} = c^\dagger_{i,\sigma} c_{i,\sigma}$ and $n_i = n_{i,\uparrow} + n_{i,\downarrow}$. The corresponding Hilbert space is spanned by

$$|0\rangle,\ |\uparrow\rangle,\ |\downarrow\rangle,\ |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle. \quad (9)$$

We can map this basis onto a description in terms of spins and spin-less fermions according to

$$|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle \to |n_\Delta = 1\rangle \times |D\rangle, \quad |0\rangle \to |n_\Delta = 1\rangle \times |H\rangle,$$
$$|\uparrow\rangle \to |n_\Delta = 0\rangle \times |\uparrow\rangle, \quad |\downarrow\rangle \to |n_\Delta = 0\rangle \times |\downarrow\rangle. \quad (10)$$

In this representation, a basis vector is characterised by an occupation number for the spin-less fermions $n_\Delta = 0, 1$ and a spin that takes values $\uparrow$, $\downarrow$. The case $n_\Delta = 1$ corresponds to either a hole or a doublon, depending on the corresponding spin state. In principe we can allow $|D\rangle$ and $|H\rangle$, to take any values on the $SU(2)$ sphere, provided that they are orthogonal, $\langle H|D\rangle = 0$, in order for Eq. (10) to define an orthogonal basis. However in practice the simplest choice is to take the eigenbasis of S_z, for example $|D\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle$, $|H\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle$.

A mapping of the original fermionic operators that preserves the anti-commutation relations can be constructed according to

$$c^\dagger_{i\sigma} \to \Delta_i(|\sigma, i\rangle\langle H, i|) + \sigma\Delta^\dagger_i(|D, i\rangle\langle\bar{\sigma}, i|)$$
$$c_{i\sigma} \to \Delta^\dagger_i(|H, i\rangle\langle\sigma, i|) + \sigma\Delta_i(|\bar{\sigma}, i\rangle\langle D, i|) \quad (11)$$

where $\sigma = \pm 1$, $|\sigma = 1\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle$, $|\sigma = -1\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle$, and Δ_i, $\Delta_i^\dagger$ are annihilation and creation operators of a spinless fermion on the site i. The operator $|\sigma, i\rangle\langle\sigma', i|$ acts on the spin of the lattice site i, where it changes the value from σ' to σ. Finally, $\bar{\sigma} = -\sigma$.

The hopping term then takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} \to &\left\{\Delta_i|\sigma, i\rangle\langle H, i| + \sigma\Delta_i^\dagger|D, i\rangle\langle\bar{\sigma}, i|\right\} \\ &\times\left\{\Delta_j^\dagger|\sigma, j\rangle\langle H, j| + \sigma\Delta_j|D, j\rangle\langle\bar{\sigma}, j|\right\} \\ &= -\Delta_j^\dagger\Delta_i|\sigma, i\rangle\langle H, i| \times |H, j\rangle\langle\sigma, j| \quad (12) \\ &+\Delta_i^\dagger\Delta_j|D, i\rangle\langle\bar{\sigma}, i| \times |\bar{\sigma}, j\rangle\langle D, j| \quad (13) \\ &+\sigma\Delta_i\Delta_j|\sigma, i\rangle\langle H, i| \times |\bar{\sigma}, j\rangle\langle D, j| \quad (14) \\ &+\sigma\Delta_i^\dagger\Delta_j^\dagger|D, i\rangle\langle\bar{\sigma}, i| \times |H, j\rangle\langle\sigma, j|. \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding physical processes are: Hole propagation (12), Doublon propagation (13), Annihilation of a doublon-hole pair (14) and Creation of a doublon-hole pair (15).

The single-site terms in the Hubbard model map according to

$$\begin{aligned} H_j = -\mu\sum_\sigma c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j,\sigma} + U c_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j,\uparrow} c_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger c_{j,\downarrow} \to \quad (16) \\ -\mu(1 - \Delta_j^\dagger\Delta_j) + (U - 2\mu)\Delta_j^\dagger\Delta_j|D, j\rangle\langle D, j|, \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

where the constant term $-\mu$ can be dropped.

The next stage is to map the spin part of the new Hamiltonian onto two-component fermions through Fedotov-Popov fermionisation [7]. The new 'spin-fermions' have creation and annihilation operators $a_\sigma^\dagger, a_\sigma$. The state vectors map according to

$$|S = \sigma\rangle \to |n_\sigma = 1, n_{\bar{\sigma}} = 0\rangle, \quad (18)$$

where the states $n_\sigma = n_{\bar{\sigma}} = 0$ and $n_\sigma = n_{\bar{\sigma}} = 1$, are unphysical as they have no correspondence in the original degrees of freedom.

In order for this transformation to preserve the partition function it is necessary that the trace over unphysical states is zero, and that the physical and unphysical sectors do not couple. Consistent with these considerations we let the spin-operators map according to

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma\rangle\langle\sigma| \to \left(\frac{1}{2} + \sigma S_z\right),\ S_z = \frac{1}{2}\left(a_\uparrow^\dagger a_\uparrow - a_\downarrow^\dagger a_\downarrow\right) \\ |\sigma\rangle\langle\bar{\sigma}| \to a_\sigma^\dagger a_{\bar{\sigma}}. \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

Here, a few remarks are in order: First, these operators do not couple the physical and unphysical sectors since they preserve the number of spin-fermions on a lattice site. Secondly, when acting on the physical space (where lattice points have precisely one spin-fermion) we find that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} + \sigma S_z\right)|\psi\rangle = a_\sigma^\dagger a_\sigma|\psi\rangle,\ |\psi\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle \text{ or } |\downarrow\rangle, \quad (20)$$

so that the operators are equivalent to $|\sigma\rangle\langle\sigma'| = a_\sigma^\dagger a_{\sigma'}$ in the physical sector. This construction also results in unphysical spin-states forming a degenerate eigenspace of the spin operators, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma\rangle\langle\sigma|a_\uparrow^\dagger a_\downarrow^\dagger|0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}a_\uparrow^\dagger a_\downarrow^\dagger|0\rangle,\ |\sigma\rangle\langle\sigma|0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle \\ |\sigma\rangle\langle\bar{\sigma}|a_\uparrow^\dagger a_\downarrow^\dagger|0\rangle = 0,\ |\sigma\rangle\langle\bar{\sigma}|0\rangle = 0. \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

A consequence of this is that the Hamiltonian treats unphysical state vectors equally in the following sense: Suppose $|\psi\rangle$ has an unphysical lattice point i with 0 spin-fermions, and that $|\psi'\rangle$ is identical to it, except that i has 2 spin-fermions. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\psi|H|\psi\rangle = \langle\psi'|H|\psi'\rangle \text{ and} \quad (22) \\ \langle\psi|e^{-\beta H}|\psi\rangle = \langle\psi'|e^{-\beta H}|\psi'\rangle \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

i.e. the expectation value of the Hamiltonian is invariant when altering the type of unphysical state. These states are then removed from the trace by introducing

$$H' = H + \sum_i \frac{i\pi}{2\beta}(n_{i\uparrow} + n_{i\downarrow} - 1). \quad (24)$$

so that

$$\langle\psi|e^{-\beta H'}|\psi\rangle = -\langle\psi'|e^{-\beta H'}|\psi'\rangle, \quad (25)$$

and the contributions from the unphysical sector cancel. The Hubbard model then takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} H = \sum_{ij,\sigma} t_{ij}\Big\{&\Delta_j^\dagger\Delta_i|\sigma, i\rangle\langle H, i| \times |H, j\rangle\langle\sigma, j| \\ &-\Delta_i^\dagger\Delta_j|D, i\rangle\langle\bar{\sigma}, i| \times |\bar{\sigma}, j\rangle\langle D, j| \\ &-\sigma\Delta_i\Delta_j|\sigma, i\rangle\langle H, i| \times |\bar{\sigma}, j\rangle\langle D, j| \\ &-\sigma\Delta_i^\dagger\Delta_j^\dagger|D, i\rangle\langle\bar{\sigma}, i| \times |H, j\rangle\langle\sigma, j|\Big\} \\ +\sum_i \Big\{&\mu\Delta_i^\dagger\Delta_i + (U - 2\mu)\Delta_i^\dagger\Delta_i|D, i\rangle\langle D, i| \\ &+\frac{i\pi}{2\beta}(n_{i\sigma} + n_{i\bar{\sigma}} - 1)\Big\} \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined

$$|\sigma, i\rangle\langle\sigma, i| = \left(\frac{1}{2} + \sigma S_{i,z}\right),\ |\sigma, i\rangle\langle\bar{\sigma}, i| = a_{i,\sigma}^\dagger a_{i,\bar{\sigma}}. \quad (27)$$

The linear part of the new Hamiltonian describes a lattice of uncoupled spins; interactions are then mediated by the spin-less fermions.

The purpose of this mapping is an efficient description near half-filling and for moderate-strong interaction. Consistent with this aim we find that while the original Hubbard model features an onsite repulsion term $\sim U$, the transformed model only includes a substantially weaker interaction $\sim U - 2\mu$, that describes the energy difference between holes and doublons and which consequently disappears at half-filling.

When $U - 2\mu$ is also large, this mapping can be combined with second fermionisation, so that doubly occupied sites are removed from the configuration space and

replaced with hard core bosons that are then fermionised [11]. In this way, the large expansion parameter can be removed from the Hamiltonian.

When the filling factor is less than unity and the onsite repulsion is much greater than the bandwidth, the t-J model (4) can be derived as an effective description of the Hubbard model through canonical transformation of the latter and truncation of terms subleading to $\sim t^2/U$ [12]. Inserting (11) into (4) and fermionising the spins, we obtain the transformed t-J model:

$$H = \sum_{ij} \Big\{ t_{ij} \sum_{\sigma} \Delta_j^\dagger \Delta_i |\sigma, i\rangle\langle H, i| \times |H, j\rangle\langle\sigma, j| + J_{ij}(1-\Delta_i^\dagger\Delta_i)(1-\Delta_j^\dagger\Delta_j)\Big(S_i\cdot S_j - \frac{1}{4}\Big)\Big\} + \sum_i \Big\{\mu\Delta_i^\dagger\Delta_i + \frac{i\pi}{2\beta}(n_{i\sigma}+n_{i\bar\sigma}-1)\Big\}, \quad (28)$$

where the spin operators are given by (27). Because unphysical doubly occupied sites are part of the Hilbert space, these have to be explicitly removed from the partition function. In the original t-J model, the projection onto unphysical state vectors takes the form $P_j = c^\dagger_{\uparrow,j}c_{\uparrow,j}c^\dagger_{\downarrow,j}c_{\downarrow,j}$. Using (11) we find the transformed projection operator $\tilde P_j = \Delta_j^\dagger\Delta_j|D,j\rangle\langle D,j|$. Since $[H, \tilde P_{j,D}] = 0$, we can use universal fermionisation to remove the doublons. The projected Hamiltonian is given by

$$H' = H + \frac{i\pi}{\beta}\sum_j \Delta_j^\dagger\Delta_j|D,j\rangle\langle D,j|(c^\dagger_{A,j}c_{A,j} - 1/2), \quad (29)$$

where $c^\dagger_{A,j}$, $c_{A,j}$ are creation and annihilation operators of the auxiliary fermionic field.

Since doubly occupied sites are not part of the physical space of the t-J model, the spin-less fermions can unambiguously be interpreted as holes and we can consequently understand (29) as a hole-doped Heisenberg model. Correspondingly, the chemical potential of spinless fermions is $-\mu$, and their density vanished as $\beta\mu \to \infty$, $\mu > zt$. For this reason, the statistical weight of the unphysical sector goes to zero as we approach half-filling, and the singular behavior of the density matrix is removed by the transformation. To see what this implies in practice, it is instructive to compute the filling factor in the atomic limit in the same way as in (6):

$$H' = \mu\Delta^\dagger\Delta + \xi\frac{i\pi}{\beta}\tilde P(n_A - \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{i\pi}{2\beta}(n_\sigma + n_{\bar\sigma} - 1) \quad (30)$$

$$\langle 1 - n_\Delta\rangle = 1 - \frac{e^{-\beta\mu}(1+\cos(\pi\xi/2))}{2+e^{-\beta\mu}(1+\cos(\pi\xi/2))}. \quad (31)$$

When $\beta\mu$ is large, (31) has a weak dependence on ξ, suggesting that it converges rapidly. Expansion in ξ gives

$$\frac{1}{1+e^{-\beta\mu}} + \frac{e^{\beta\mu}\pi^2\xi^2}{16(1+e^{\beta\mu})^2} - \frac{e^{\beta\mu}(e^{\beta\mu}-2)\pi^4\xi^4}{768(1-e^{\beta\mu})^3} + ... \quad (32)$$

and we find that all terms of finite order in ξ scale as $\sim \exp(-\beta\mu)$. Thus, in the limit of half-filling the correction to the density matrix from projection terms approach zero rather than diverging.

In conclusion, we find that by applying spin-charge transformation to lattice fermions we obtain a description in terms of spin-less fermions and spins that can subsequently be fermionised. We can understand this as a generalisation of the Fedotov-Popov fermionisation technique to the case when holes and doublons are present in a spin system.

In the transformed models, there is no singular behavior of the density matrix associated with half-filling and strong interactions. Rather, we do in this case simply recover the corresponding spin-model. In this sense, doping takes the form of a perturbation to the underlying spin system.

Strongly interacting lattice fermions near unit filling is an extremely challenging and important problem for which viable numerical approaches are a high priority. For spin models, there is on the other hand a successful record of using Diagrammatic methods in combination with Fedotov-Popov fermionisation. I argue that real progress in understanding and being able to simulate correlated fermionic systems is possible by treating them as doped spin-models.

This work was supported by the Wenner-Gren Foundations in Stockholm though a postdoctoral stipend. Computations were performed on resources provided by the Swedish National Infrastructure for Computing (SNIC) at the National Supercomputer Centre in Linköping, Sweden. The author would like to acknowledge crucial discussions and input from Boris Svistunov and Nikolay Prokof'ev.

[1] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2863 (1992).
[2] T. Maier, M. Jarrell, T. Pruschke, and M. H. Hettler, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 1027 (2005).
[3] N. Prokof'ev and B. Svistunov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 250201 (2007).
[4] Y. Deng, E. Kozik, N. V. Prokof'ev, and B. V. Svistunov, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **110**, 57001 (2015).
[5] "Simons collaboration on the many electron problem," https://www.simonsfoundation.org/mathematics-and-physical-s
[6] J. P. LeBlanc *et al.* (Simons Collaboration on the Many-Electron Problem), Phys. Rev. X **5**, 041041 (2015).
[7] V. N. Popov and S. A. Fedotov, Sov. Phys. JETP **67**, 183 (1988).
[8] S. A. Kulagin, N. Prokof'ev, O. A. Starykh, B. Svistunov, and C. N. Varney, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 024407 (2013).
[9] S. A. Kulagin, N. Prokof'ev, O. A. Starykh, B. Svistunov, and C. N. Varney, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 070601 (2013).
[10] Y. Huang, K. Chen, Y. Deng, N. Prokof'ev, and B. Svistunov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 177203 (2016).
[11] N. V. Prokof'ev and B. V. Svistunov, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 073102 (2011).

[12] K. A. Chao, J. Spałek, and A. M. Oleś, Phys. Rev. B **18**, 3453 (1978).